OT 2 8 2005

AF

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number	09/725,326
Filing Date	November 28, 2000
First Named Inventor	Crosby, Matt
Art Unit	2625
Examiner Name	Perungavoor, Sath V.
Attorney Docket Number	11086.000844
Confirmation Number:	5891

L				Committation (Valide	•	3031		
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)								
☐ Fee	e Transmittal			Drawing(s)		After Allowance communication to Group		
☐ Fee Attached			Licensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences			
			Petition		Appeal Communications to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)			
×				Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Proprietary Information		
☐ Affidavit/declaration(s)			Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		Status Letter			
☐ Exte	☐ Extension of Time Request			Terminal Disclaimer	⊠	Acknowledgement Postcard		
☐ Exp	☐ Express Abandonment Request			Request for Refund		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
☐ Information Disclosure Statement			CD, Number of CD(s)					
☐ Cer	☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Rer	narks	l			
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application								
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53								
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT								
Firm or Stephen B. Salai Individual name		ai, 26,990, Harter, Secrest & Emery LLP						
Signature Signature								
Date October 26, 200		5						

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING								
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.								
Type or printed name	e Mary A. DiPaolo							
Signature	Maryablaro	Date	October 26, 2005					

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Confirmation No:

5891

Applicant:

Crosby, Matt

Atty. Docket:

11086.000844

Application No.:

09/725,326

Examiner:

Perungavoor, Sath V.

Filed:

November 28, 2000

Art Unit:

2625

Title:

TECHNIQUES FOR GENERATING A DISTRIBUTED LOW-RESOLUTION

DIGITAL IMAGE CAPABLE OF VIEWING IN ANY RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated July 26, 2005, please reconsider the claims in light of the following remarks:

Applicant thanks the Examining Attorney for his especially helpful explanation of the basis for the rejection. It appears to applicant that there are only a few issues in dispute. Applicant thanks the Examining Attorney for the withdrawal of the objection to the drawing and written description. Applicant thanks the Examining Attorney for the approval of the terminal disclaimer and the withdrawal of the double patenting rejections.

Regarding claims 1-4, 11 and 12, applicant believes that there is a fundamental disagreement concerning the reference and more particularly concerning the ImageCropRect function. The Examiner notes, correctly in our